



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, XXXV, 4.

1. Pp. 497-513. A. Ludwich. On the Paraphrase of Nonnus. Metrical observations and criticism of the text.

2. Pp. 514-528. H. Gelzer. The Period of Gyges. "Demnach ist es überflüssig die thörichte, noch neuerdings von Cox aufgewärmte Ansicht zu widerlegen, als seien Gyges und seine Gemahlin gar keine historischen Persönlichkeiten, sondern Sonnengottheiten und Naturpotenzen." Both the mythical and the historical elements of the story are discussed,—the latter minutely and in the spirit of reconstruction.

3. Pp. 529-542. H. van Herwerden. Ad Plutarchi Vitas. Continued from XXXV, 3. Corrections proposed for 117 passages.

4. Pp. 543-563. F. Schoell. The Interpolation of Cicero's Speech for Caelius. S. argues that Halm went too far in denying the genuineness of the passages added by a later hand in the Cod. Parisinus, and discusses several passages (§§ 24, 35, 52, 80), attempting to detect the traces of genuine tradition. The method followed seems fully justified; but S. does not and could not claim precise certainty in the results reached. He admits the partial interpolation of the passages in question, and continues: "Nur hat man ganz Aehnliches und Gleiches, wie das Beanstandete bisher bestehen lassen, hat die einmal festgestellte Thatsache der Interpolation nicht consequent verfolgt und ausgebeutet." S. attempts this neglected duty. In reporting his views, as the interesting nature of the subject makes it desirable to do fully, it is generally impossible to report or to attack his arguments; and in the reader's interest the order of the oration rather than of Schoell's discussion is followed. In 3 he writes *habitam esse hodieque haberi*, striking out *summam*. In 4 he strikes out *ista*. In 5, *si nituntur iudicio suorum*. In 6 the words *ut ad me revertar* are condemned,—unnecessarily. In 7 he rejects *maledicendi* (*hunc m. locum*). In 8, *qualis es talem te existiment* and *at non sine argumento*, writing *sine ulla suspitione*. In 9 he writes *nemo M. Caelium*, striking out *hunc*. In 10 he proposes *studuerunt, mecum existimetur*. In 18 he strikes out *quod quidem iam in hac aetate minime reprehendendum est*, and further on *migrationemque*. In 21 he writes *gloriosum etiam esse*, striking out *hoc*. In 22 he strikes out *facillime fingi*. In 23 he writes *et si Asicio plus profuit*, striking out *causa*. In 26 he rejects *non me haec movent* and then writes *etenim una cenasse*, omitting *eos*. In 30 he writes *ut oportet respondere*, omitting *ita*, and further on casts out *aurum sumptum a Clodia, venenum quaesitum quod Clodiae daretur, dicitur* and *non crimina sed maledicta*. In 31 the Wolfenbüttel MS has *paravit quam locum*,—the *quam* not appearing in other MSS. S. remarks that *paravit* needs an object and suggests *paravit opem*. In 35 he writes *ut verear*, omitting *et*. In 36 he writes *ex tuis igitur sunam aliquem*,

and further on *fuiſti non numquam eius domi, in hortis*. In 37 he writes *vix ferendi*. At the end of 45 he propoſes to read *quod nos facimus non modo agendo dicendoque, verum*, with a hint that perhaps the *dicendoque* is an interpolation. In 48 he condemns *ego rem deſuiam*. In 49, *ſeſe in meretricia vita collocavit et aquis, navigatione, conviviiſ*. At the end of 50 S. cuts off everything after *impudentia*, holding the words to be of the nature of marginal explanation, with the poſſible exception of *et huic*, which may be a corruption of a genuine word. In 54 the words *neque neglexiſſet* are condemned. S. ſupports his attack by calling attention to the following *neglegere potuiſſet* and *neglegeret*. At ſuo gladio ſe iugulat. Cicero recurs three times with cumulative force and with evident intent to the argument of the original *neglexiſſet*, juſt as he recurs twice (*leniter ferret—diſſimulandum putaret*) to the *tuliſſet* which follows *neglexiſſet*. In 57 he caſts out *quibus omnia committantur—qui verſentur iſdem in voluptatibus—per quos gerantur*. I have little hesitation in admitting the fact of interpolation here, much more in accepting his metes and bounds. Poſſibly the words to be rejected are *quibus occulta credantur* and nothing more. In 71 S. writes *Vettiano ſtupro*, omitting *nefario*. In 77 he rejects *bonorum virorum*. In 78 he writes *cum ſuo coniuge et turpiſſimum*, ſtriking out *fratre*. He finds in the *fratre ſi* of the Wolfenbüttel MS a corruption of an old marginal note, *fratre ſc*.

5. Pp. 564–568. P. Egenolff. In *Herodianum Technicum critica*. A collation of a manuſcript at Copenhagen, ſhowing the need that ſtill exiſts for an accurate edition of Herodian.

6. Pp. 569–577. H. Hagen. On a new Epigram with the heading *Octaviani Auguſti*. The epigram is in a manuſcript of the tenth century at Berne, which contains the text of Priscian and a variety of extracts from various ſources, many of them written in *notae Tironianae*. Hagen gives a facſimile of the epigram and deciphers it as follows:

Octaviani Auguſti.  
Convivae, tetricas hodie ſecludite Curas :  
Ne maculent niveum nubila corda diem.  
Omnia ſollicitae vertantur murmura mentis,  
Ut vacet indomitum pectus amicitiae.  
Non ſemper gaudere licet. Fugit hora; iocemur !  
Difficile eſt Fatis ſubripuiſſe diem.

A conſiderable commentary follows, in which every ſyllable is diſcuſſed in an effort to prove that the lines are in the manner of the Auguſtan age and fit the character of the man whoſe names (not his name) are found with the epigram. A note of the editor offers the reader a warning againſt too ready credulity.

7. Pp. 578–585. L. Ahrens. The Inſcription from Olympia, No. 362. This inſcription has been published and explained by Kirchhoff in the *Archaeologische Zeitung*. Many readers will doubtleſs be glad to ſee it in the form which Ahrens gives it. He reads:

Ἄ Εῤῥάτρα τοῖς Φαλείοις. πατριὴν θαρρῆν καὶ γενεὰν καὶ ταὐτῶ, | αἱ ζή τις κατὰ-  
ραίσειε Φάρρενον Φαλείω, αἱ ζέ μήπιθειαν τὰ ζι | καὶ αὖ ὅρ μέγιστον τέλος ἔχοι καὶ  
τοὶ βασιλᾶες, ζέκα μναῖς κα | ἀποτίνοιαν Φέκαſτος τῶν μήπιποέοντων καθυταῖς τοῖ Ζι

Ὀλυν | πίοι. ἐπένποι ζέ κ' Ἑλλανοζίκας, καὶ τᾶλλα ζίκαια ἐπενπ | ἔτω ἃ ζαμιωργία, αἱ ζέ μῆρποι, ζίφωον ἀποτινέτω ἐν μαστρά | αι. αἱ ζ(έ) τις τὸν αἰτιαθέντα ζικαιῶν ἱμάσκοι, ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναῖαι κ' ἐ | νέχο(ιτ)ο, αἱ Φειζῶς ἱμάσκοι. καὶ πατριᾶς ὁ γροφενς ταῦτα κα πάσκοι. | (ἄκ)ω(ητῖ) κ' ἔο(ι) ὁ (πῖ)ραζῖ ἱαρὸς Ὀλυνπίαι.

In the form ἐπένποι Kirchhoff sees an equivalent of ἐκπέμποι, Ahrens of ἐφέποι.

8. Pp. 586–606. C. Paucker. De Latinitate Claudiani Poetae Observationes. Statistical remarks on peculiarities of vocabulary, formations and meanings of words, syntax.

9. Pp. 607–609. A. Philippi. The Battle of Arginusae and the Decree of Kannonos. A very plausible argument to prove that the words κατὰ τὸ Κανωνοῦ Ψήφισμα in Xen. Hell. I 7, 34 are interpolated.

10. Pp. 610–626. W. Ribbeck. Homeric Miscellany. Discussion of μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερά and of the νύσταθος, with not a little polemic irony directed at Naber's theories about the growth of the Iliad.

11. Pp. 627–630. F. Bücheler. Old Latin. Two brief chapters,—the first treating an inscription recently found near Spoleto (Spoletium), which we copy : honce loucom nequs violatod neque exvehito neque exferito quod louci siet, neque cedito nesei quo die res deina anua fiet; eod die quod rei dinai causa (f)iat, sine dolo cedre (l)icetod. Seiquis violasit, Iove bovid pialcum datod; seiquis scies violasit dolo malo, Iovei bovid pialcum datod et a. CCC moltai suntod. eius pialcli moltaique dicator[ei] exactio est[od]. This inscription B. refers to the period preceding the Second Punic War. He quotes the explanation of δικάτωρ from Hesychius, and finds it so confirmed by the evidence of this stone as to leave no doubt that *dicator* is a good Latin equivalent of *dictator*. The *res dina* of the inscription supports the reading of the Cod. Vetus in Plaut. Epid. 314, where B. writes: *dum* rem dinam faceret, (quae) cantaret sibi. The second chapter treats the word *sedulo*, of which queer etymologies are more or less current. It is, like *obviam*, *denuo*, simply two words in one,—*se dolo* = sine dolo. From the adverb thus formed sprang up, by a familiar process, the adjective *sedulus* and its further derivatives, not found earlier than Cicero.

12. Pp. 631–640. Miscellany. N. Wecklein reads μάχης in O 459 and rejects 460—doubtless right. His change in II 128—ἔλῃσι for ἔλωσι—seems over-acute. He remarks: "If the ships burn up, the Trojans cannot get possession of them." Very true; but if the Trojans get possession of the ships, they can spread the fire.

F. Bücheler recurs to the inscription from Olympia copied above, and calls attention to its importance in illustrating the conflict between law and ancient custom. The riddle about the meaning of ἐπένποι, etc., is surely solved when B. points out the phonetic equivalence of ἐνπει and Latin *inquit*. He compares *coinquere* and refers to the various senses of *putare*, *legere*. But in this case he translates ἐπένποι by *indictet multam*.

A. Stachelscheid gives the marginal notes in Bentley's copy of Gellius.

J. Klein treats of P. Rubrius Barbarus, Praefect in Africa under Augustus; of Sulla Cerialis, one of the victims of Heliogabalus; and of L. Tullius Pon-

tianus Gentianus, a favorite of Faustina—all with the aid of materials furnished by the inscriptions.

F. Schöll replies to a critic of his notes on Quintilian (R. M. XXXIV 84 ff.)

J. Freudenthal adds a few words to his discussion of Phavorinus (R. M. XXXV 408 ff.)

J. Steup calls attention very neatly to several loose joints in the armor of Wilamowitz.

### XXXVI, 1.

1. Pp. 1-10. B. Schmidt. Tribute to the fame of Boges on an Attic Hermes. The epigram upon Kimon's victory at the Strymon, which was graven upon these Hermae in the Agora at Athens, is quoted both by Aeschines (in Ctes. 184) and by Plutarch (Vita Cim. 7), the text given by the manuscripts of Plutarch being in the main decidedly nearer the original. S. points out that Plutarch can hardly have borrowed the epigram from Aeschines, that the epigram, in fact, does not really belong to the text of Aeschines. He thinks it probable that Plutarch borrowed directly from some compiler of historical documents, most likely Krateros, and that we have in the text of Aeschines a modified interpolation from the same source. But the word *πρώτοι* in v. 4 of the epigram is puzzling. Of course the form upon the actual stone would have been *ΠΡΟΤΟΙ*. This S. interprets as dative singular *πρώτῳ*, and understands it to refer to Boges, whose story, told by Herod. VII 107, must have been in the mouths of all Athenians at the time when these Hermae were set up. The neat and satisfactory character of this explanation can hardly be denied.

2. Pp. 11-25. F. Ruehl. On the Codex Laurentianus, 53, 35, with additional matter touching the most recent investigations on Cicero's Letters. A letter from Florence, giving a mass of palaeographic detail about the handwriting of Petrarch and the much-discussed manuscripts of Cicero's Letters.

3. Pp. 26-37. W. Christ. Notes on Homer. C. defends the combination of subjunctive and optative in Γ 54, 55, by citing the similar expression in a closely similar situation at Δ 386. In the latter passage the subjunctive is necessary to the metre. C. refers also to X 42, μ 345, ρ 539. But X 42 is hardly a parallel passage, and perhaps Aristarchus is not so very much to blame for writing *έδοιεν* there. Of course we have all been told he did not know much Greek; but then, he did know some. C. then gives nearly a page to E 338, reaching the conclusion: "So lange daher niemandem etwas besseres einfällt, wird man bei der Vermuthung Heyne's [*i. e.* to regard *πέπλον* as neuter and write *δ οί*] stehen bleiben müssen, wenn man auch Bedenken trägt dieselbe geradezu in den Text aufzunehmen." δ 692, C. gives good reasons for doubting the optative *φιλοίη*, proposes to read *φιλείη*, defends the latter as a good subjunctive form at length and very satisfactorily. The optative *επιβρίσειαν*, ω 344, is troublesome; and C. proposes to help the matter by treating the words *ένθα . . . έασιν* in 343 as parenthetical. The change of the tense is paralleled in κ 349. The form *είοικνύαι*, Σ 418, C. declares to be a monstrosity. He writes *νέηρισσιν ΦεFικνύαι*. In ψ 517 he points out that *δς τε* and not *δς ρα* is wanted—*δς τε άνακτα*. In I 455 he regards *οίσαν* as a possessive of the first person. E 293, he writes *έξέλυθεν*; Δ 706, *διείλομεν* for *διείπομεν*.

4. Pp. 38-49. J. Asbach. The Chronology of Pliny's Letters.

5. Pp. 50-86. G. F. Unger. The Lupercalia. Four topics : (1) The names of the priestly fellowships, the Quintiliani and Fabiani. Unger concludes that resemblance of sound in the names to *quinquare* (= *lustrare*) and *februare* led to the choice of the Quintilii and the Fabii as the most suitable patricians for headship in these early priesthoods. (2) Evidence of change in the significance of the worship during the third century before Christ. This change came from the belief which grew up in the efficacy of the ceremonies in preventing the barrenness of women. Earlier the only purpose had been to ensure the strength of the Palatine fortifications against invasion. (3) The names of the divinity worshipped. U. refers the name Lupercus to *lux*, *lues*, and *purco*, and explains it as *averruncus luis* or *luæ*. Lupercus has been generally identified with Faunus. U. argues against this, maintains that in early times the real name was a matter of mystery. (4) Concluding that this real name was Inuus, U. discusses the Etruscan divinity Inuus at length, holding him in his turn to be Juppiter, the god of the sky, appearing under a special name and with special attributes.

6. Pp. 87-115. Th. Bergk. On Aristotle's account of the Athenian Constitution. Blass has recently published (Hermes XV) some fragments, found on tattered bits of Egyptian papyrus, which he ascribes to Theopompus. Bergk makes it exceedingly probable that Aristotle is the real author—that the fragments belong to the πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων. The most important fragment throws some light on the state of parties at Athens before the legislation of Solon. Another relates to the institution of ostracism, and confirms the tradition that Kleisthenes fell a victim to his own innovation.

7. Pp. 116-119. O. Ribbeck. New Readings. "Da man nicht wissen kann, wann entweder die von Ritschl eingesetzten tres viri oder der Strassburger Thensaurichrysonicocrypsides zu der Bearbeitung des Miles gloriosus kommen werden, . . . so will ich einige Mittheilungen über neue Palimpsestlesungen, welche ich der Freundlichkeit G. Löwe's verdanke, nicht länger zurückhalten." The Ambrosianus has in 683 ESSEE (or T) ME (or I) IDMULTOLEPIDIUSEST, and after *bona uxor* in 684 LUDUSDURUSTSISITUSQUAM, and in 685 EAPOSSITINUENIRI. R. writes: *liberum esse me, id multo lepidius*, and *nam bona uxor ludus durust, si sit usquam gentium, ubi ea possit inveniri*. In 686 A. has *eme, mi vir*, but leaves out *tibi*. In 689 the palimpsest has Fleckeisen's *e somno*, in 690 Ritschl's *munerem*, in 692 Scaliger's *præcantrici*, in 697 *quæ supercilio spicit*. In 708 A. has *hi apud me aderunt, me curabunt, visent quid agam, quid velim*. Ribbeck thinks, if this be genuine, *si* must stand at the beginning of the verse. In 712 there is a *me* after *abducunt*; in 715 there is a *me* before *certatim* (so Bugge). In 716, A. has TUAMUITAMABES. R. writes: *tuam vitam vales*. In 720, A. has *si ei forte fuisset*; in 721, *aut de equo uspiam*; in 722, DE (or I) FREGISSET; in 724, *usui est* (so Ritschl's conjecture); in 737 and 738 *iam* is omitted. In 740, stands *quantum sumptum*, and R. writes *quantum sumptuum fuerit*. In 745, *serviendæ servituti*. In 747 *si illis aegrest* (so Camerarius); then MIHIEO (or ID) QUOD (R. *mi id quod*); then *meo remigio rem gerunt*. In 748, apparently *odios*. In 791, *ex matronarum*. The close of 793 R. had already assigned to Pleusicles. This he finds con-

firmed by the new reading of 794: ATSCIETISPOSTEAECQUA, *i. e.*, at *scietis post eae ecqua*. In 797, A. has *quasique*, and *hoc* instead of *hunc*. In 800, two letters stand before *dabo*. R. writes *ego rectis meis* (sc. manibus) *ei dabo*. After 1401, A. has a verse beginning with AG. R. conjectures this may have been an address to the *Iorarii*. Ritschl's note on 1406-8 is a mistake.

8. Pp. 120-126. E. Meyer. Original sources for the war of Antiochus the Great with the Romans. An argument in support of Nissen's view (against Mommsen) that Appian is substantially dependent upon Polybius, and that Polybius got his account from Greek sources (mainly Rhodian). Livy owes much to Polybius, but shows something of the influence of Roman annalists.

9. Pp. 127-130. F. v. Duhn. The harbor of Pompeii. A portrait-bust, a gold chain, two bracelets, a ring, a lamp, a drinking cup, were found all together a few years ago near Pompeii, and passed into the hands of a resident of Naples. In the wall by which these objects were found was a marble tablet bearing the inscription SEX. POMPEIVS SEX. L. RVMA NEPTVNO.V.S. L. Evidently a sailor had here paid a vow made while at sea to Neptune. This inscription, then, closely fixes the position of the (or a) temple of Neptune. But Neptune's temple must have been close to the water. And the place of this inscription (near the "Molini") confirms Ruggiero's view of the ancient coast-line. This is plausible, but hardly conclusive.

10. Pp. 131-160. Miscellanies. P. Cauer proposes to read, β 203, οὐδ' ἀποτίσαι. For the construction he compares, among other passages, Φ 565.

W. Ribbeck continues from XXXV 469 his notes on the scholia to the Iliad.

N. Wecklein gives critical notes on several Greek authors. Aesch. Sept. 326-332 and 338-344 he proposes should change places, and in like manner 835-839 and 843-847. For 385 he proposes ὁμφάκων πρυγερὰν δρόσον, an attractive conjecture at first sight, though it may well be doubted whether this gives what must have been the Aeschylean word-play in ἀρτιδρόποις ὁμοδρόπων. W. remarks that the first stasimon is capable of a natural division into twelve parts, perhaps divided among the twelve choreutae. Sept. 282, he proposes ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' ἀρχαῖς ἐξ. 480, μηδὲ μοι λήρων φθόνη. 482, τοῖσι δὲ δυστομείν. Several emendations of the scholia on the Septem follow: 310, τῆς ὑγρᾶσίας δεσπότης. 398, τὰ ἐπίσημα οὐδὲ ὄπλα, and φέρων αὐτὰ γένοιτο γενναῖος. 457, Ἐτεόκλῳ ἐξέθορον ὁ κλῆρος. 692, παρορμᾷ εἰς τὸ κτανεῖν τοὺς ἀνδρας. 727, ταῦτα κρινεῖν κατὰ τῶν παίδων. Soph. O. T. 896, τί δέι με θουσκεῖν,—comparing the gloss of the Cod. Laur. with Hesych. on θουσκεῖν. In both places the words are disordered. W. conjectures that the marginal explanation in the Cod. Laur. was originally ἱεροῖς πονεῖν ἢ τοῖς θεοῖς χορεύειν; the words of Hesych.: θουσκεῖν ἱερὰ παρέχεσθαι ἢ θεοῖς χορεύειν. The combination seems doubtful at the best; nor can I feel that the objections to χορεύειν in the text of Sophocles are weighty. Ai. 179, W. proposes χαλκοθώραξ λῆστω Ἐννάλιος; 919, φλεβὸς μελανθέν. Tr. 328, κακὴ μὲν αὐτῆς; 1018-1021, μείζων ἂν εἴη ἢ δι' ἐμοῦ σωκεῖν· σὺ δὲ σύλλαβε· σοί τε γὰρ ὄμμα ἐμπλεον—ο—ο—ο—ψαῖω. Frag. 761 (Dind.), κοπίς ταχεῖ ἐθήχθη καὶ ταχεῖ ἄμβλύνεται. Eur. Hipp. 1148, ποῖ τὸν τάλαν' ἐκ πατρίας γὰς. Iph. A. 213, ἐκόνει; 251, περωτοῖσιν ἀρματήλατον; 674, αἴσιον σκοπεῖν. Cyc. 505, σκάφος ὀκλάδος γεμισθείς. Frag. 773, τί ποτε τοῦδ' ἐπαίτιον; 899, βάρβαρος μέθων.

Lysias XII 88, τῆς παρ' αὐτῶν τιμωρίας; XIII 36, the words ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐδύνασθε are stricken out. In 90 W. writes οὐδένα γὰρ ὀρκον οἱ ἐν Πειραιεὶ τοῖς ἐν Πειραιεὶ οὐδ' οἱ ἐν ἄστει τοῖς ἐν ἄστει ὤμωσαν. XXV 5, W. thinks the clause ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀδικούντας τιμωρεῖσθαι cannot have been written by Lysias, since punishment of the Thirty is out of the question, but may have been added by the client who delivered the speech. Was it, then, this client who revised the speech for publication? 22, W. writes: τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεδιότας. In 27, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις περὶ ὁμονοίας. Plat. Lach. 189 C, striking out δέ before μεταξὺ,—καὶ αὐτὰ ἂν ἀκούσω, ἐὰν μεταξὺ ἄλλοι λόγοι γένωνται, οὐ πάνυ μέμνημαι,—a very neat and convincing correction. Apol. 21 D, τῶν δοκούντων σοφωτέρων εἶναι,—striking out ἐκείνων. 27 E, ὡς οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν καὶ δαιμόνια καὶ θεῖα καὶ δαίμονας καὶ θεοὺς ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ αὐτοῦ μήτε δαιμόνια μήτε θεῖα μήτε δαίμονας μήτε θεοὺς, οὐδεμία μηχανή ἐστιν,—a thoroughly good sense with changes which are, under all the circumstances, not violent enough to excite a scruple.

W. Dittenberger calls attention to a long-known Attic inscription (Boeckh, Opusc. VI 6, 386) with the name Μασαννάσα.

K. K. Müller gives critical notes on a Heidelberg MS. containing excerpts under the name of Planudes.

A. Viertel explains the mistake of Flavius Blondus in thinking that Petrarch was not acquainted with Cicero's letters to Atticus.

A. Duncker reports the discovery of a fragment of a manuscript of Cicero de Officiis in the binding of an old book at Cassel.

K. J. Neumann shows that Minucius Felix, in his Octavius 7-10, borrowed from the lost argument of Cotta in Cic. de Nat. Deorum III. The place from which the extract was taken followed III 65.

A. Stachelscheid sends from London Bentley's emendations to Marcianus Capella.

J. W. Förster puts in tabular form the results of searching the inscriptions for the age of Roman soldiers on entering the service. He finds one or more at every age from 13 to 37, one at 46 and one at 47. The whole number of cases is 600. Of these about one-half entered between the ages of 18 and 21, about a quarter at the age of 20.

J. H. WHEELER.

#### MNEMOSYNE, Vol. IX, Part 4.

All the matter in this part is contributed by Cobet, except an article of some twenty pages by Herwerden on Isaeus. The first paper (pp. 361-369) contains remarks and emendations on Hesychius. One of the earliest of these is on the following: θριπόβρωτος: οἱ Λάκωνες σφραγίσιν ἐχρῶντο ξύλοις ὑπὸ σπητῶν βεβρωμένοις. On this Cobet remarks that the word to be explained has evidently fallen out; and this must have been θριπήδεστος. 'Veteres dicebant ἐδομαι (κατέδομαι), ἐδήδοκα, ἐδήδεσμαι (κατέδηδεσμαι), ἡδέσθην (κατηδέσθην), ἐδεσμα, ἐδεστὰ καὶ ποτὰ, ἐδώδιμος. Haec omnia apud Graeculos in desuetudinem abierunt proque iis dici coepta βρώσομαι, βέβρωκα, βέβρωμαι, ἐβρώην, βρώμα, βρωτὰ καὶ ποτὰ, βρώσιμος, quorum pars apud Veteres in usu fuit, sed rariore et fere poetico. Sic igitur ὁ ὑπὸ θριπῶν κατεδηδεσμένος a Veteribus dicebatur θριπήδεστος, a Graeculis θριπόβρωτος.' After illustrating further the use of these



forms he says: 'sed in futuri forma vehementer Graeculi peccant. Prorsus interiit *έδομαι, κατέδομαι*, proque eo Favorinus *βρώσομαι* dixit, et faex Graeculorum et barbari Graece balbutientes in Aegypto et Palaestina *φάγομαι* constanter usurpant. Reprehendit haec omnia Phrynichus in Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 37, 30: *έδει—έδονται: οί μὲν άμαθεις φ ά γ η λέγονσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος. 'Ο δὲ Φαβαρίνος—τῷ β ρ ω σ ο μ α ι ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐχρήσατο.* In Vetere ac Novo Testamento constanter *φάγομαι* scribitur et in secunda persona etiam vitiosius *φάγεσαι*.' Two or three other specimens of these notes may be given: '*άμακίς: άπαξ. Κρητες.* Scrib. *άμάκίς* ex antiquo et obsoleto *άμός* pro *εις*, cuius certa impressa vestigia sunt in *οὔδαμοί, μηδαμοί* Ionice pro *οὔδενες, μηδένες*, et *οὔδαμνός* id est *οὔδενός άξιος*, ut *οὔτιδανός* ex *οὔτις*, quod constanter pro *οὔδείς* in epica poesi ponitur. Item in permultis adverbiiis veluti in *άμώς* γέ *πως* id est *ἐνί γέ τῳ τρώπῳ*, et *οὔδαμώς* nullo modo, nullo facto.' '*άφών τιμή: τὸ έλαιον, ἐπεὶ ἐν τούτῳ έψονται.* Saepe miraberis apud Hesychium absurdas interpretationes, quae nec coelum, ut aiunt, nec terram tangunt. Habes h. l. luculentum exemplum. Respicit Grammaticus (Didymus) locum Aristophanis ex *Acharn.* 939 :

*εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπέυσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν 'Αθήνας,  
εὔρετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαρὰς άφών τιμὴν περιάψας.*

Sententia perspicua est: *qui Athenas appellat λιπαράς (nitidas et pingues) eum honorem vobis tribuit quae apuarum esse solet*, nempe quae ob pinguedinem laudantur. Quid autem Didymo facias, qui serio annotavit *άφών τιμήν* esse *oleum*, quod et ipsum absurdum est et salsum Aristophanis dictum *άδιανόητον* reddit? Sed festinanter talia *ὁ βιβλιολάθας* in chartam coniiciebat.'

In the next article (pp. 380-399) Herwerden offers notes and emendations on some 120 passages in Isaeus. Most of these are interesting; but few can be made available for this report. On VII 38 *οὐκ ἐκ συμμορίας τήν ναῦν ποιησάμενος ὥσπερ οἱ νῦν* he writes: 'coniecit Naberus *πορισάμενος*, quae correctio, quantumvis lenis, neutiquam admittenda esse videtur, siquidem trierarchi non magis naves *πορίζονται* quam *ποιούνται*. Civium est *παρασκενάζειν* sive *παρασκενάζεσθαι τήν τριήρη* sive *εὔτρεπίζειν*. Vide v. c. Dem. p. 1228, 5. Nisi fallor tota haec periodus sic est emendanda: *καὶ τριηραρχῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον διετέλεσεν οὐκ ἐκ συμμορίας τήν ναῦν παρασκεναζόμενος* (aoristo locus non est ob verba *τὸν πάντα χρόνον διετ.*) *ὥσπερ οἱ νῦν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ δαπανῶν, οὐδὲ δεύτερος αὐτὸς ὢν ἀλλὰ κατὰ μόνας οὐδὲ δὴ' ἔτη διαλιπὼν ἀλλὰ συνεχῶς, οὐδ' άφοσιούμενος ἀλλ' ὥς οἶόν τ' άριστα* [*παρασκεναζόμενος*]. Participium quod suo loco restitui olim inde motum erat ad explicanda verba *ὥς οἶόν τ' άριστα*, quo facto nescio quis in antiquitate Attica plane hospes pessime supplevit *ποιησάμενος*. Locus sic constitutus vide quam sit egregie compositus. In tribus ultimis membris identidem participium et adverbium sibi respondent: *δεύτερος ὢν—κατὰ μόνας, διαλιπὼν—συνεχῶς, άφοσιούμενος—άριστα*. Quot veneribus nos privavit inscita magistellorum sedulitas!' On VIII 24, *οὐ μὴ εἰσεῖ εἰς τήν οἰκίαν* he writes: 'bene sic correctum est pro *οὐ μὴ εἰσῆς τήν οἰκίαν*, sed post *οἰκίαν* requiritur signum interrogandi; quae notissima est *vetandi* ratio. Alia est ratio vocularum *οὐ μὴ* seq. Coni. aut Fut. sine interrogatione, quibus aliquid fore *vehementer negatur*.' On IX 24, *λέγων ὅτι θεῖος εἴη 'Αστυφίλῳ καὶ άποφανοίῃ διαθήκας* [*έκεῖνον καταλελοιπότα*] *εἰ τις αὐτῷ* [*1. αὐτῷ*] *κοινώσοιτο*, he writes: 'Licet grammaticae non adver-

setur locutio ἀποφαίνω τινὰ διαθήκας καταλελοιπότα, multum tamen dubito vocabula ἐκείνον καταλελοιπότα esse ipsius oratoris, siquidem constans est iuris Attici formula ἀποφαίνειν διαθήκας, ut infra § 25, ubi eadem repetuntur, utramque vocem omissam videbis—De pronomine αὐτῷ ab eiusmodi locis alieno rectissime statuit Naberus. Addam in talibus Atticis optionem esse inter οὐ, οἶ, ἐ, σφῶν, σφίσι, σφᾶς et αὐτοῦ, cett. Antiquiores fere, ut Thucydides, illam, paullo recentiores hanc sequi assolent, Isaeus semper.’

The next article (pp. 400–440) is by Cobet, and is entitled ‘Annotationes ad Livium.’ The purpose of it is to controvert the opinion of Mommsen on two points. The first is that Perseus (Röm. Gesch. I<sup>6</sup>, p. 753; Eng. Tr. II, p. 340) “inherited along with the kingdom the troubles, resentments, and hopes of his father. In fact he entered with the utmost determination on the continuance of his father’s work, and prepared more zealously than ever for war against Rome: he was stimulated moreover by the reflection that he was by no means indebted to the good will of the Romans for his wearing the diadem of Macedonia.” Cobet endeavors to show on the contrary that the war was forced by the Romans on Perseus. To decide this point he says ‘ante omnia de testium fide et auctoritate constare debet. Quatuor esse putantur Polybius, Livius, Diodorus Siculus, et Appianus in *Macedonicis*, sed sunt duo tantum; namque Livius totus a Polybio pendet et Diodorus nil nisi incredibili impudentia Polybiana descripsit. Quis sit ille testis optimus et veracissimus et rerum gestarum aequalis et παρρησιαστής, qui in Appiano libro lateat, deprehendisse mihi videor et infra ostendere conabor.’ Cobet sums up extracts from Livy and Polybius with ‘quibus si credimus Romani de bello Macedonico ne cogitabant quidem antequam Eumenes in curia crimina de Perseo detulit.’ He then quotes from Appian, *Maced.* IX ‘ante adventum Eumenis οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ταχέως ἀν-ξανόμενον τὸν Περσέα ὑφεωρῶντο καὶ μάλιστα αὐτοὺς ἠρέθιζεν ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλία καὶ γεινναίσις, οἷς ἐχθρὸς ἐς Ῥωμαίους ἐνεπεποιήκεσαν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι στρατηγοὶ κτ᾽;’ and after a long exposition of this text he continues: ‘quum diligenter mecum quaerem quis Romanorum fuisset tam audax ut scriberet’ the above passage, ‘venit in mentem Catonis. Immodice libera videtur lingua eius qui dicat: *Romanis tam cito crescentes Persei opes suspectas fuisse et male urere Romanos quod Perseus Graecorum amicitia floreret et magistratuum Romanorum iniurias ingens in animis Graecorum peperisse Romanorum odium.*’

In the next 22 pages Cobet collects the passages bearing on the origin and course of the third Macedonian war, and endeavors in several to show that Appian relies upon the elder Cato as his authority. The second point on which Cobet corrects Mommsen is (R. G. I<sup>6</sup>, p. 770; E. T. II, p. 360) the statement in Polybius and Livy (44, 13) *de tractatis inter Eumenum et Persea conditionibus amicitiae*, which Mommsen declares ‘was as certainly a fable as any newspaper *canard* of the present day’; saying further ‘that no proof was found either in the papers of Perseus or elsewhere is sufficiently certain.’ Against the last statement Cobet quotes Diod. Sic. XXXI 7, 2 *ὑπόπτως εἶχον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένην ἐνεκεν τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν εἰρημένων ἐν οἷς συμμαχίαν ἦν συντεθειμένος πρὸς Περσέα κατὰ Ῥωμαίων.* Cobet shows that the change in the feelings of the Romans towards Eumenes after the fall of Perseus which Mommsen attributes to a determination ‘to render all the Hellenic states, friend and foe, forever incapable of harm,’ is better explained by assuming

that the reports about the bad faith of Eumenes, which Mommsen admits were current, were also true; and as to the unlikelihood of the astute Eumenes engaging in any negotiations with the enemy of Rome, he says: 'magis mirandum est quo pacto ὁ πανουργότατος βασιλεύς, tam cautus, tam perspicax quam callidus et astutus non providerit id fore quod factum est. Scilicet conversa repente est fortuna belli. Omnia propemodum μέχρι τῆς Παύλου στρατηγίας Romanis adversa fuerunt, et difficillimi belli taedio, ut vidimus, ad pacem componendam inclinati erant animi. Eumenes operam suam venditat Perseo Romanis aut faventibus aut certe non improbantibus. Itaque securus per occulta colloquia et legationes id quod susceperat aggressus est. Sed ubi Pauli virtute repente debellatum est, Romani in pacis conciliatorem Eumenem eodem animo fuerunt quo in Rhodios eadem conatos.'

Cobet then (pp. 441-444) comments on the interpretations of an 'antiquissima inscriptio nuper Romae reperta' furnished by Dressel and H. Jordan. The letters COSMIS occur. 'Quid est COSMIS? Bücheler respondet COMES: Jordan contra COMIS esse putat' and connects it with κόσμος. 'Fugit subtilissimi ingenii virum non *comis* et κόσμος, sed *comis* et κώμος esse inter se cognatissima. Nempe ἀνὴρ κόσμος (ordentlich) plus gravitatis habet quam comitatis. Contra κώμος (κωμάζειν, κωμαστής) ad amussum cum Latino *comis* congruit. Οἱ κωμάζοντες inter se optime volunt, sunt *humani, benigni, hilares*, et quia in lautis epulis sumtui non parcityr, iidem *splendidi* sunt et *prodigi*. Res est, ut vides, manifesta. Derides, inquires. Fortasse, sed tam facile est ista imitari.' After more criticism in the same vein Cobet says: 'non premam denique suspicionem, quae mihi diligenter haec omnia consideranti subnata est. Saepius in Italia et nonnumquam etiam extra Italiam factum est ut inscriptiones circumferrentur spuriae aut per iocum aut ab impostoribus fictae. Ante hos paucos annos in patria nostra scurra nescio quis protulit inscriptionem litteris Runicis conceptam, cuius prima verba erant OBA et RONIE aut RONJE. Quis nostratium non meminit ridens quantum ineptiarum illa inscriptio pepererit, donec tandem KERN noster sollertissime fraudem deprehendit? Idem nunc Romae factum esse suspicor. Commentus est id scurra aliquis ut homines pereruditos sed non admodum acutos ludificaretur. Νᾶφε καὶ μένυας' ἀπιστεῖν.'<sup>1</sup>

The last article (pp. 445-448), as well as parts of previous pages otherwise unoccupied, contain notes by Cobet on various passages of Galen. There is also supplied an index to this ninth volume.

C. D. MORRIS.

---

ARCHAEOLOGISCHE ZEITUNG. Jahrgang XXXIX. 1881. Four Numbers.

I. The first number opens with an article by O. Benndorf on some technical points in the manufacture of Greek vases. A theory held by Jahn, Semper and Blümner is criticized in the light of observations made at the British Museum by the writer. His view is that in the older vase manufacture the process was not simply to cover the original clay with black and then to produce outline drawings in red by discovering the color of the clay, but that after these *graffiti* were thus made their lines were filled with a white pigment, which seems to be the same used, especially for the naked portions of female figures, as an

<sup>1</sup> See Amer. Jour. Phil., III, p. 107.

*engobe*. Of this white filling very extensive traces are noticeable in the collection at the British Museum. *Graffiti* pure and simple seem to occur only in coarse and careless work; the better vases have all a white or a light yellow filling. In some cases even a dark red filling is noticeable. Traces of the gradual disappearance of this the writer sees in the scratched outline around the (black) hair of the later figures in dark red. This outline it seems was long filled with red according to the technical traditions of the older style, but finally in the perfected style no incision was made—a hair's-breadth of the plain red surface was left instead.

Next Gustav Krüger discusses a bust said to represent Euripides, which is among the comparatively recent acquisitions of the British Museum. He agrees with Mr. Newton in considering it an admirable work, and gives in a rather dim photograph both its front and its profile. It is strikingly like other heads supposed to represent Euripides, and yet sufficiently unlike them, the writer thinks, to make it certain that this bust was not from the same original portrait-statue of the poet with the others. There seems no reason why any one who is so inclined should be restrained from taking this bust as an excellent portrait of Euripides.

Ernst Curtius then discusses the 'Telamones' or 'Atlantes' which adorn and dignify a certain bronze tablet on which is seen an inscription in honor of Apollonius, the whole dedicated by the town of Anisa. I have said 'Telamones,' because two are represented in the cut at the head of the article. Only one is really preserved, but the longing eye may still see the toes of the second figure; and, with such a hold upon it, some one has found it the simplest and easiest thing in the world to enrich us with the whole figure. Surprise at this unexpected good fortune should not, however, interfere with the writer's general discussion of the use of 'Atlantes' and Caryatids in ancient architecture and decoration. His statement of the limits within which such figures were used in the better days of art is what might have been expected. The rule was: You must not call upon any figure to carry what it is manifestly too weak to bear, nor must you put all that it can support on its back and then make it dance or reel in any of the various irrelevant and exhausting ways exhibited by the Atlantes and Caryatids of the decline of Art.

Then comes an article by Löschke describing an interesting work in clay found at Tanagra. Perhaps we can stretch the term vase so as to include this tripod in clay. The three supports give an opportunity for Medusa's two sisters to pursue Perseus. The fact that Perseus is beardless and unarmed is compensated for by the safe distance which separates the foot of the tripod where he is represented from the two occupied by his grinning pursuers. The cauldron supported and surrounded by this agonizing pursuit is adorned with a more genial scene. Here we see a bacchanalian offering, but the cover brings us back to a chase—this time we see a hunter and two dogs in hot pursuit of a hare; just such a scene is described as represented in beaten metal on the shield of Heracles.

This last scene provokes the writer to an investigation, in the course of which he maintains that this 'vase' was of Athenian workmanship. Further he claims that the theme of a hare pursued by dogs was borrowed in the earliest

days from workers in beaten metal by the potters and handed down more or less mechanically. Aside from the combination of dogs and a hare, the earliest art seems to have given only mechanical rows of this or that species of animal. The mention of a scene of this kind in the shield of Heracles confirms what is apparent after an examination of many early works like this one. The pursuit of a hare was a favorite subject with decorators of vases at Athens and Corinth from the middle of the eighth century to the beginning of the fifth. If we wish to go back of the time when the Shield of Heracles was probably written, then we are referred to Layard's Nineveh, where rows of running dogs may be seen used in decoration in stripes alternating with rows of running hares, or again, rows of alternating dogs and hares; rows of running men are similarly used. From this to the scene under discussion the early decorators advanced by putting two and one together, which in this case has made four, *i. e.* one man, two dogs and a hare. Various common scenes from Homer—so they came to be regarded—are then shown to have had a similarly mechanical and purely decorative origin.

Among various short notices in this number it is interesting to find an attempt to defend Apollo from that libel upon the beauty of his later god-head—the Apollo of Tenea in the Munich Glyptothek. Perhaps many will be too glad to believe that this is no Apollo.

II. The second number is opened by an article from F. Hultsch, who is regarded as especially qualified by his researches to enlighten the world as to the various Greek units of measure. In this article is examined the bearing which the new measurements of the Samian Heraion by M. Barthélémy de St. Hilaire have upon our knowledge of the unit of length used by various architects on various Greek temples. To begin with, the ratios of the various dimensions of the Heraion are examined. The new measurements, which are rather vague, suggest a correction of Gell's figures. This is made somewhat arbitrarily to suit the convenience of the writer, who proceeds to ask: Is the simple proportion of 1 : 2 found in the ratio of length to breadth in the case of the lowest or the highest of the steps or terraces on which the Heraion is built? The breadth of the uppermost step is 50.67 m. If the length were twice this it would be 101.34 m. This is the measurement of length which the writer argues for in an abstruse and complicated plea of which no summary is here desirable. The general considerations, suggested by Hultsch's analysis of the dimensions of the Samian Heraion, the Ephesian Artemision and other temples, he thus expresses: "The various ratios"—of the number of pillars in front to the number on the side, of the breadth and length of the lowest platform to the breadth and length of the cella—"move this way and that, and the course of their variation may be compared to a pendulum in motion. The simple relation of 1 : 2 we may compare to the pendulum at rest; this we find *once* in the conspicuous dimensions of the temple. Starting from this ratio, by addition and subtraction we reach the other dimensions. They stand in new ratios to each other, each one of which has a harmony of its own. The combination of them all gives a surprising rhythmical concert which may be not inaptly compared to a great musical composition." Returning to the narrower but more com-

prehensible discussion as to what unit of measurement was practically employed, our writer tells us that several were used side by side; he mentions two ells, one royal and one national—this last was subdivided into thirds, two of which made a foot, in very common use.

Just at this point it is well to leave the second number and take up by anticipation the first article in the fourth number, which is a very careful attack upon Hultsch's premises and conclusions, written by Wilhelm Dörpfeld, known in connection with the Olympian excavations. Dörpfeld practically maintains these points: (1) "All the actual measurements used by Hultsch are inaccurate; he has changed some arbitrarily, and others he has reached by arithmetical blunders." (2) "Granted for a moment that the dimensions used in forming the ratios are correct, 'the resulting self-evidence (*Durchsichtigkeit*) of proportions' is a delusion and a snare." (3) "It is an insult to our common sense to suppose that an architect would measure the front of his building with one unit and the side of it with another."

Returning to the second number, we find R. Engelmann describing two Spartan Mosaics (Plate 6) which are to the unilluminated eye particularly unpleasant. One of them represents Achilles at Scyros and the other the rape of Europa. It is consoling to hear that they are of late workmanship, belonging probably to the first century after Christ. Plate 7 is a colored lithograph reproducing a statue of Aphrodite, a rather fleshly and distinctly fleshy goddess here, leaning upon a very unpromising smaller figure of Elpis. The interest of this group, unearthed at Pompeii in March 1873, is derived from the well preserved traces of color, which are somewhat imaginatively reproduced in the plate and are minutely described by K. Dilthey. The chiton of Hope is green, but she is otherwise rather yellow. Aphrodite is chiefly arrayed in gold ornaments and yellow garments as far as she has raiment at all.

Next P. Robert discusses (in connection with various other vases obviously representing the same scene) an Athenian *aryballos* upon which is painted the embassy to Achilles. The heroes of the scene are Odysseus, who has just ended his telling speech; Ajax, sullen and muffled up in his grief, who has only half listened; Phoenix, who stands behind engaged in a very pretty quarrel of his own with Diomedes; Diomedes is turning away disgusted with so much vain delay. The Odysseus here—unlike the same hero in other vase-representations of this scene—suggests the influence of Phidias and his Parthenon sculptures. No doubt these designs exercised a great influence upon the development of art in all its subsidiary branches. The writer further maintains that in this representation the account of Homer has been followed and Diomedes has been proleptically introduced. Finally, A. Milchhöfer gives some account of one of the many monuments in honor of the great historian Polybius. It is disheartening to note that these numerous monuments in various places were dreary repetitions of one and the same design.

III. In the third number we have an article by K. Lange on the Athena Promachos of Phidias and kindred representations of that goddess. He argues that the figure of Athena so common on Athenian coins is a careless

reproduction of the great original Promachos statue, or was at least suggested by it. This leads to his theory that the shield of the Promachos was raised aloft and did not rest on the ground. The statue was not enormous, and therefore the decorative reliefs of the shield could, he argues, be seen. But at the same time he seems to urge that because they could not be seen the great Phidias was not responsible for them and they were added later. It ought to be just as impossible archaeologically as it is gastronomically to have your cake and eat it too, therefore this point in the argument is not well taken. In seeking to identify with the general type of the Promachos other statues and reliefs enumerated by Sybel as coming from some one early original, the writer claims that the Parthenos was an earlier creation of Phidias than was the Promachos. Pausanias says the Parthenos came after the Promachos, but this means that it took a much shorter time to finish and cast in bronze what was really the later conception (the Promachos) than was required to elaborate the chryselephantine perfections of the Parthenos.

Next comes No. III of A. E. J. Hollwerda's Olympian studies. This chapter is devoted to the Pentathlon. Pinder's work and an article by Percy Gardner have raised a question as to the terms on which the prize in the Pentathlon was awarded. Pinder begins by fixing the order of the five contests as follows: *ἄλμα ἀκόντιον δρόμος δίσκος πάλη*. Then he claims that no athlete who failed to achieve a given minimum in leaping was allowed to enter the contest of spear-throwing; the four best spearsmen entered the foot-race; the three best runners cast the discus, and the two best discus-throwers were allowed to wrestle. This distressing complication of the game was proved impossible by Percy Gardner, who, however, substituted a theory of his own about the matter. It is to overturn this theory that Hollwerda comes forward. Having with a vigor worthy of a competitor in the Pentathlon utterly routed all men with views on the subject, our author proceeds to give his own, which he says is really an old theory propped up with new quotations. Three out of the five events gave the victory. Under this rule, if a man won the first three or the second third and fourth, the whole contest was decided without recourse to the *πάλη*. As to the order of the events he quarrels with Gardner and his Panathenaic Amphora, which is no better than others where the order is reversed. His conclusion favors this order: *ἀκόντιον* (third) *δρόμος* (fourth) *πάλη* (fifth); whether *ἄλμα* or *δίσκος* came first is, he thinks, past our finding out. The article closes with some detailed observations on the *ἄλμα δίσκος* and *ἀκόντιον*.

The next fifteen pages of this third number are devoted to O. Puchstein's article on the vases of Cyrene. This account is the forerunner of a more detailed treatise on the subject. The writer attacks what Luyves has said to the effect that it was impossible to classify Greek vases according to their place of manufacture with any certainty. In these later times, he declares, there has been great progress toward such classification. Then he takes a list of vases classified as Cyrenaic by Brunn, Klein and Löschke, and shows the points of similarity, which proves that there was a special tradition among the potters of Cyrene.

(1) The favorite form of cup adopted by the Cyrenaic makers was a slight modification of the hemispherical cup. About half an inch below the rim its semicircular (elliptical) outline is drawn in and thence spreads out, forming a lip. In all these cases the bowl is placed on a high, slender support and has two horizontal handles, but this of course is not peculiar to Cyrene.

(2) Many traces and peculiarities point for the potters of Cyrene and Rhodes to a common inspiration, which came from Cyprus and its school of workers in metal. "Both in their ornamental details," says the writer, "and in the composition of more elaborate scenes, the vases of Cyrene like those of Rhodes show the influence of a school of workers in beaten metal who must have been Phoenicians and probably worked in Cyprus." The writer specifies peculiar lotus-patterns and the decorative use of the pomegranate as especially characteristic of Cyrene.

(3) As to the subjects selected for illustration by the painters of the Cyrenaic school, they are largely 'genre' scenes. Prometheus also is a favorite, and Heracles, but hardly any of the greater gods. This may, however, be due to an accident that has left comparatively few vases from Cyrene. In a footnote to Mr. Clarke's admirable report upon his investigations at Assos, attention is called to one of the scenes from a Cyrenaic vase reproduced on Plate 12 of this number. The scene is the combat between Heracles and the Centaurs, the same represented in low relief on the temple at Assos. A common peculiarity in the two representations consists in the introduction of Centaurs with human forelegs along with the ordinary kind of Centaur with four horse-legs.

IV. The fourth number has less that is of especial interest. Of the first article directed by Dörpfeld against Hultsch I have spoken above. F. Dehnecken describes minutely a very beautiful, though sadly mutilated, bas-relief in the Louvre. It represents in one and the same scene a visit of Dionysus at the board of a mortal and the apotheosis or canonization of that mortal. W. Gerhard gives a careful account of certain rather uninteresting splinters of pottery recently gathered together in the Brunswick collection. A. Milchhöfer writes about some very meaningless Spartan works of art.

Max Ohnefalsch-Richter gives a brief account of his excavations near Larnaka in Cyprus. He dug into a "Phoenician grave" and it soon turned out to be a "Roman bath."

In the account of the various meetings in honor of Winckelmann we hear of Professor Schaafhausen at the Bonn meeting, where he gave an account of Fraas' unearthing Athenian vases and bronzes near Stuttgart. These vases date back, it appears, to the fourth century B. C.

It will not be possible to give any account of the most important and interesting Olympian Inscriptions published in three of these numbers. A list of numbers must suffice. In the first number are published and explained Nos. 381-392; in the second Nos. 393-414. In the third number there are none; in the fourth number are published Nos. 415-423.

Finally come the reports from Olympia. In Report 46 Wilhelm Dörpfeld tells of the final discovery of the Pelopion. This had been sought



before in vain ; a long trench had been dug to find it, but, as luck would have it, the trench passed through two corresponding openings in the wall of enclosure. Chance finally yielded what forethought long had sought. To the east of the Pelopion traces, supposed to be the great altar of Zeus, have been found, and also they have uncovered the Leonidaion mentioned by Pausanias.

In Report 47 Georg Treu gives some account of the heads of marble, the bronzes and the terra-cottas found during the last year. Among them are a head of Aphrodite, suggesting the school of Praxiteles, and fragments (most useful in restoring the group) of the head of Sterope from the eastern tympanum of the great temple.

LOUIS DYER.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch. Wien, 1881. Heft 3, 4.

Fedor Bech begins the third number with a paper proposing emendations in L. Ettmüller's edition of Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob). B. specially treats of Ettmüller's reading of certain passages in Frauenlob's Kreuzleich, Minneleich, Frauenleich and Sprüche.

A. Raszmann follows with an interesting article "Wodan und die Nibelunge," in which he reviews the opinions that are held by Mühlhoff (Z. f. deut. Alt. 23, 113) and others on the much debated subject of the Volsungs, and takes occasion to correct some of his own statements in his Helden-sage, I, 22. In treating of the probable origin of the Nibelungenhort and its baneful influence on each possessor, R. brings forward evidence of a close connexion between the ransom of the Asas (Andvari's gold) paid by them for the slaying of Hreidmar's son Otter, and some mythological facts which are found among several Indo-European races. Assuming the etymological relation of the Norse word *otr* with the Sanskrit *udra*, the Greek *ὐδρα* and the Slavic *vydra*, the article attempts to prove by citations from the Avesta, from the Greek Herakles myth and Slavic mythology, that the killing of an *udra* (otter) must have been looked upon by the Aryans as a fearful crime for which only death could atone. The water was held sacred, and with it the animals that inhabited it. Whether Raszmann has made out his case as regards the connexion of this fact with the killing of the otter and the subsequent terrible penalty in the story of the Volsungs may be doubted, but at all events every one interested in the subject ought to read this clever article.

K. Rehorn subjects the early authorities for the life of Bruder Berthold (1250) to a critical examination, beginning with the abbot Hermann of Niedernaltaich (1242) and closing with the compilers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The life of Berthold has in late years been investigated with such care by Grimm and Pfeiffer, and in 1876 again by Wackernagel and Rieger in *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete*, as to show numerous conflicting statements in the writings of Berthold's earliest chroniclers.

We still need a full and reliable history of this remarkable preacher. Rehorn contributes some additional matter touching the subject, and hopes that it will not be long before some master-hand will collect the materials offered and give to the world a complete picture of the life and labors of brother Berthold.

C. M. Blaas furnishes Bruchstücke aus einem mitteldeutschen Arzneibüchlein, formerly in the city archives of Kronenburg and now in the imperial library at Vienna. J. Haupt of that city places the date of these fragments in the beginning of the fourteenth or end of the thirteenth century.

Tell-Dellingr-Heimdall, by Friedrich Neumann. This paper criticises sharply a contribution "Neues zur Tellsage," by A. Rudolf in Herrig's Archiv 63, by whom Tell Dellingr is conceived as the morning. However much we may differ otherwise with Neumann's views, in this we must confess we incline to his opinion, "wenn Tell Dellingr der morgen ist, so ist die ganze Tellsage willkürliche erfindung." The suggestions offered by N. with reference to the legend are more ingenious than convincing. The incidents of the Tellsage, he thinks, might by a poetical change imply occurrences manifest to every eye during a thunderstorm. The sun and thunder-clouds are personified. Tell, representing the sun, meets his enemy Gessler, the thunder-clouds. In the small cloud, forerunner of the storm, that caps the mountain, we have Gessler's hat, which Tell heeds not. Gessler's eye flashes and the distant rolling of thunder betokens his wrath. Gessler approaches and Tell must shoot at his child. The sun's children are mankind, and before a thunderstorm the rays of the sun (Tell's arrows) sting, *i. e.* the heat is oppressive. The first dark clouds step before the sun, and bounding forth to the right and left, his rays appear under them. They are the remaining arrows (?) that would have pierced Gessler's heart if the first had chanced to hurt the boy. But enough. We can quite appreciate the readableness of the article and give the writer credit for the best of intentions, but we could have welcomed a less fanciful explanation of the legend. The arguments which Neumann advances to establish identity of Tell Dellingr with the Sun-god and Heimdall = Heimdeglingr, seem to us likewise susceptible of modification.

The origin of the proverb "Morgenstunde hat gold im munde," forms the subject of a short paper by Robert Geete. Dissenting from L. Tobler (Germ. XXV) who explains mund = os and assigns to the saying a mythological origin (Heimdall), Geete believes the word *mund* to mean *hand*—Morgenstunde hat gold in der hand—(A. S. munt, O. H. G. munt, O. N. mund = manus), and does not see why we should go to mythology for an explanation of the proverb when it might very naturally have sprung up among the people.

Fedor Bech sends a short article on the word *leben* in the following lines of the Nibelungenot (ed. Bartsch) 698, 3-4 :

Do gewan dar umbe Hagene *ein* zornlichez *leben* ;

Er sprach "jan mac uns Gunther zer werlde niemen gegeben."

In the introduction of Bartsch's Wörterbuch zu der Nibelungenot, p. 31, the strange expression in this verse "ein leben gewinnen" is commented upon.

Other M. H. G. dictionaries do not speak of it. Bech has found in the course of his M. H. G. readings several instances which show that *leben* often has the sense of *muot* = animus. In a second paper Bech quotes a passage from *Denkwürdigkeiten des Hallischen Ratsmeisters Marcus Spittendorf* ed. Opel, p. 272, and proves by it that in the last half of the fifteenth century the language of the common people in Halle an der Saale was still the Low German, entirely distinct from the Middle German which we meet in the city documents of that time.

The text of a Faust volkslied found in Graz by Adalbert Jeitteles, and fragments of a Tristan poem sent by the custos of the Bohemian museum in Prague to H. Lambel, complete the list of the original articles in the third number.

Felix Liebrecht reviews the second edition of the third volume of Leon Gautier's great work *Les Épopées Françaises*, and bears witness to the eminent merit of this almost exhaustive work on the subject. The work displays throughout the unflagging industry and scholarly research of Gautier. The notes contributed by Liebrecht in his review are a valuable addition to Gautier's text.

H. Lambel criticises K. Sass's essay *Über das Verhältniss der Recensionen des niederdeutschen Spiels von Theophilus, Elmhorn 1879*. Of the three known copies of the Low German Theophilus, the Helmstädt, the Stockholm and Treves MSS, the essay assigns to the first, from internal evidence of the poem, a place nearest to the lost original. With this Lambel agrees (and we may add that most German scholars have done so long ago), but dissents from the views of Sass as to the relation which the Stockholm MS bears to the other two.

The Miscellany contains a communication from Adelbert Jeitteles, "Ein Augsburger Judeneid," and A. Raszman sends additional matter regarding his article *Wodan und die Nibelunge*. There are some minor communications besides from Fedor Bech, J. Franck, Reinhold Bechstein, A. Birlinger, Dr. Möller, Pfarrer Falk and Alfred Landau. Among the personals we notice the death of Dr. Eduard Müller (author of the well-known *Etymological Dictionary of the English language*) and of Adalbert Kuhn.

A. Jeitteles' final answer to A. Schönbach's sharp criticism of J.'s *Alt-deutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul* closes the third number.

The fourth number leads off with a paper by Reinhold Bechstein, *Drei Conjecturen zu Hartmann's Iwein*. The reading of verses 3372, 73

"Nû jach des ein ieglich man  
Wie er verloren wære,"

in the Lachmann and Bech editions MSS (a) Bb, was rejected by Paul (Beiträge I, 374) and in this B. thinks he was justified. Variants show a better reading, thus D: nu dûht er sî ein gevellich (c. siecher, d. schicklich) man. They all, however, lack more or less the suitable adjective describing *man*. Bechstein proposes the adjective *schellich*, *schellic* = crazed, and reads in

his Anthology, Stuttgart 1881, "nu dûhte er sî ein schellic man," which expresses well the impression of the maiden upon beholding Iwein. In v. 3474 (ed. Fedor Bech): darzuo sî vil stille sweich, Bechstein derives the word *sweich* from swichen, geswichen = entweichen, verlassen (cf. Wb.), not from swîgen = schweigen, and supplying the dat. *im* prints: darzuo sî im vil stille gesweich. Vs. 3254-56 (ed. Lachmann) read:

doch meistert vrou minne  
daz im ein krankez wîp  
verkêrte sinne unde lîp.

Bechstein inserts the acc. *im* before *vrou* in the first line.

J. Kottenkamp follows with an article embodying further results of his Tristan studies. In the space of six pages he examines and explains a number of verses in the epic which hitherto seem to have been misunderstood by translators. K.'s essay Zur Kritik und Erklärung des Tristan Gottfried's von Strassburg was published in 1879.

P. Piper furnishes a list of Altdeutsche Pflanzennamen, and K. Frommann discusses the orthography and use of the pronoun *das* and the conjunction *dasz* in Luther's Bible. Originally the same word, they were spelled alike—M. H. G. *das*, N. H. G. (fifteenth century) *das*. The older (M. H. G.) spelling *das* and its contraction *dz* (changed in the second half of the sixteenth century to *dasz*) were, however, not entirely dropped, but often used indiscriminately for *das* by the printers. Luther in his earliest and later works employs the spelling *das* for both pronoun and conjunction. The proper definition of the word, particularly in the Bible translation, must therefore always be well considered. F. adduces a number of examples from the Luther Bible in support of this. After comparing some thirty different editions (older and later) of the German Bible, F. finds that v. 19, chap. 1 in Paul's Epistle to the Romans reads in all of them: Denn *dasz* man weisz, *dasz* Gott sey, ist ihnen offenbar, *i. e.* the existence of God is manifest to them. Although this is the meaning generally given to this passage by Germans, it is contrary to the original text (cf. Engl. Bible). The Bibles of Herborn (1619), Pfaff, Gerlach, and the Nürnberg edition of 1703 express the verse differently, and none of them found out the correct reading of the Luther text, which simply needs (according to our present spelling) the substituting of *das* (= was) for *dasz* (man weisz), cf. Canstein edition 1867 and edition of the Prussian Bible Society. F. further calls attention to Luther's use of *das* for *dasz es*, cf. Jer. 2, 24: Wenn es vor grosser Brunst lechzet, und läuft, *das* (*dasz es*) niemand aufhalten kann, etc. In Isaiah 51, 6 we find the pronoun *das* = eine kleinigkeit, ein nichts: Der Himmel wird wie ein Rauch vergehen, und die Erde wie ein Kleid veralten, und die darauf wohnen, werden dahinsterven wie *das*. Luther explains in a marginal note, "Solch *das* mus man mit eim Finger zeigen, als schlüge man ein Kliplin mit Fingern." cf. R. Hildebrand in Grimm Dict., Vol. 5, 1209, also W. Grimm in Vol. 2, 806, and Eng. transl. of Bible passage.

Ludwig Laistner examines the Provençal Alba published by J. Schmidt in the Z. f. deutsche Philol. 12, 335, and concludes "Dass der verfasser ein geist-

licher und das gedicht selbst ein geistliches ist." L. also contributes a minor article Zum Reinfrid und Archipoeta, and Fedor Bech sends Nachträge appertaining to articles in Germania XXIII, XXIV, XXV.

A list of recent publications in the field of Germanic philology by the editor Karl Bartsch, and brief communications from R. Maurer, H. Deister, A. Jeitteles and F. Liebrecht, close the fourth number.

C. F. RADDATZ.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOLOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN U. MASIUS. 1881.

I.

1. Pp. 1-16. A. Römer of Munich, who is well known to the readers of the Jahrbücher by his articles on the scholia of Homer, reviews Hermann Schrader's edition (Fasc. I, Leipzig, 1880) of the fragments of Porphyry's Homeric Problems, relating to the Iliad. The catechetical *ζητήματα* and *λύσεις*, introduced by Aristotle, appear in their most dreary state in the problems of Porphyry. Some of them, it may well be, rest upon observations of Aristarchus, but others combat his views. In the scholia of the first hand the *ζητήματα* appear in their clearest, purest form. Many additions of little worth and concerning matters of little interest were introduced by the second copyist. Much which belongs to the later hand is given in this edition as in the MSS, under the name of Porphyry, without any strict criticism on the part of the editor, who has collected and arranged the fragments without separating the chaff even when the end of a scholion was indicated in Ven. A by a new lemma. The editor was careless also in neglecting too much the various readings in Ven. B. Schrader had made himself, however, thoroughly familiar with his subject, and his work may be welcomed as a careful treatment of an uninviting theme.

2. P. 16. R. Arnoldt of Königsberg conjectures *ἀδρανεῖς* for *ἀφανεῖς*, Aristides XI, p. 130 Dind.

3. Pp. 17-30. H. Blümner of Zurich, the editor of an elaborate edition of Lessing's Laocoön, discusses the new interpretation of the Laocoön group. Archaeology has made great strides since Winckelmann's day. New points of view have been opened and old theories discarded. From the literary sources, students had reconstructed the sculptures in the pediments of the temple of Zeus at Olympia on the model of the Parthenon, as it was known that their sculptors were scholars or contemporaries of Phidias. The fragments are brought up from the alluvial soil of the valley of the Alpheus, and are found to be of comparatively hasty, rude workmanship. The same excavations have shown that the Hermes (Antinous) of the Belvedere, which was thought to belong to the school of Lysippus, is really Praxitelean. So the discoveries at Pergamos, which promise to concentrate upon themselves the art-interest of the cultured, seem likely to change our views of the condition of Greek art under the successors of Alexander. Yet the Laocoön group will always be of interest because of the great names, Lessing, Goethe, Winckelmann, etc., connected with it. In spite of the heap of literature which has collected on the subject, no one up to this time has been able to decide whether this group belongs to the time of the *diadochi* or to the first century of our era. The question now

proposed, however, relates only to the interpretation of the group. Its *motive* (the killing of the father and both sons) was never disputed until less than three years ago, when Brunn made known the view of his friend Bernard Stark, that, as in the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus, only the father and younger son were killed by the serpent. To this view Stark seems to have been led by Goethe's remarks concerning the beautiful climax—the elder son only entangled by his arm and foot, the younger son firmly held in the serpent's coils, the father bitten by the other serpent as he endeavors to free his sons and himself. The artist, according to Goethe, chose the moment of the highest interest; fear, horror and sympathy are all expressed. The poet's observation is to be corrected in so far as the younger son is *in articulo mortis* and the father's efforts are all directed to oppose the serpent, to save his own life. It is true that the elder son seems so slightly involved that he might be freed, but did the artist intend to give the impression that he *would* be freed? This must be answered in the negative. There appears no determined effort for safety on his part. He yields to the danger and forgets himself in his father's sufferings. In a moment the left arm of Laocoön will sink, and the serpent having accomplished his work with him, has but a slight movement to make to reach this eldest son in the most vital spot. Sophocles and the following poets make both boys die, and the artist was more likely to follow them than Arctinus. Surely if the artist worked in the reign of Titus he must have followed Vergil's form of the story.

4. Pp. 30–32. Ziegler of Stuttgart notices Heinrich Kraz's translation of and notes to the three orations of Pericles as given by Thucydides (Nördlingen, 1880), and briefly calls attention to his views on different passages.

5. Pp. 33–44. Schweizer Sidler gives an appreciative review of H. Jordan's critical contributions to the history of the Latin language (Berlin, 1879). Jordan has shown that the influence of the Etruscans was not preponderating in the choice of the form in which Greek names were adopted in the early Latin language. He holds that they were borrowed from some dialectic form, not making his view so precise as G. Meyer, who thinks the Etruscan names were derived from Ionic forms, the Latin names from Doric forms. Pollux, Polluces is derived from Poluduces, Poluluces. The change from *d* to *l* in this word is assumed as taking place on Italian soil, as also the change of *ss* to *x* in 'Ὀλυσσεύς, Ulixes, or Uluxes. Jordan's arguments to prove that the old Latin Melerpanta is not a capriciously altered form but comes from a dialectic Μελλεροφάντης, are not considered convincing.

6. Pp. 45–58. Brix of Liegnitz, the editor of Plautus, likens the contents of Langen's contributions to the criticism and exegesis of Plautus (Leipzig, 1880) to the treasures discovered with spade and shovel in Greece and Asia. L. has studied Plautus's versified language of popular conversation without taking as his canon the literary language of Cicero. No one has determined the peculiar Plautinian use of so many constructions. The result is valuable not merely for the explanation and criticism of the plays of Plautus, but also for the history of the development of the Latin language in forms and syntax and meanings of words. Thus *paenitet me* does not mean 'to be sorry' in Plautus; nor *commodus*, 'favorable'; nor *resistere*, 'to oppose'; nor *reprehendere*,

'to blame.' Plautus does not use the forms *dis*, *dites* for *dives*, *divites*, nor *mori* for *moriri*, nor the constructions *orare ab aliquo*, *precari ab aliquo*, *cupere ut*, nor *statim* in temporal sense, nor *unus idemque*, nor *invidere* with a dative of the thing, nor *debere* with the infinitive. Such positive determinations of usage not only cut off many superficial conjectures, but also give a valuable criterion for the criticism of suspected passages. The book, the ripe fruit of long-continued studies, is recommended as an *ἐγχειρίδιον*, especially as an introduction to the study of old Latin for the younger generation.

7. Pp. 59-79. W. Brandes commends the careful presentation of a mass of new material by Peiper on the MS tradition of Ausonius in the eleventh supplementband of the *Jahrbücher*, but differs from him on two points. Peiper conceived of an original collection of the Ausonian poems as the source of both our collections—that found in Vossianus (V) as well as that found in Tilianus (Z), but that the latter contained the gleanings of smaller poems which were added after the author's death. But from certain letters it is known that Ausonius never published his works except as he sent them one by one to his friends. By a comparison of the dated poems it is shown that V was compiled later than Z. But Z seems to be neither the first volume of the poet's collected works nor the last gleanings after his death. It was begun by some friend of the poet about 370 A. D. and received additions until about 383 A. D. V has suffered some lapses, but represents the edition which the poet at his death left unpublished, with the addition of poems which were afterwards collected, probably by the poet's son Hesperius, from letters, loose sheets, etc.

8. P. 80. P. Stengel of Berlin corrects a prevalent view that only female or emasculated male victims were sacrificed to the gods of the nether world, and indicates the probability that this belief is due only to the scholiast's false interpretation of Hom. *λ* 30.

## II.

9. Pp. 81-93. W. Jordan of Frankfort continues his "Homeric novelties" (see *Am. Journ. Philol.* II 266). The motto of the tragedy of the true Iliad is found in Σ 107-110. *Χόλος* is used here in the sense of 'revenge,' which is *γλυκίων μέλιτος*, but is followed by the stifling (*ἥνυτε καπνός*) feeling of regret. (This interpretation, like many of the rest, must be regarded as novel rather than probable.) In the suspected passage Σ 590-606, the *κυβιστητήρ* must be among the onlookers, and thus we have a distinct separation into two groups. T 147-153 show that Achilles still cherishes his anger against Agamemnon. (They show rather the intensity of Achilles's grief for Patroclus and rage at Hector, which make all treasures seem of little account.) *Ἀπαρέσσωσθαι*, T 183, is not a strengthened *ἀρέσσωσθαι*, but means 'to refuse to be appeased.' In Υ 18, *ἀγχιςτα* is to be connected closely with *δέδηκε* in the sense of 'has almost broken out.' In Υ 70, *χρυσηλάκατος* applied to Artemis is 'spinning gold,' with reference to the golden light of the moon, as he would translate *ἀργυρότοπος*, 'shooting silver rays.' In Φ 1-328, the different parts of the scene are artistic and full of life, but their combination is unsatisfactory. The appeals of the Scamander to the Simois and Apollo are both but fragments; they are unanswered. Jordan supplies the appropriate replies. The scheme which he

suggests for the new arrangement of the book is too elaborate and uncertain to find place here. Τρωτὸς χρώς, Φ 568, is to Jordan an indication that the myth of the invulnerability of Achilles was known to the Homeric poets, although in general it is the divine armor which cannot be pierced.

10. Pp. 93-94. Julius Caesar of Marburg, to show that the study of mythology needs not only a lively imagination but also a firm hold on strict philologico-historical methods, calls attention to the carelessness of two mythologists; one of whom (Schwartz) writes of Zeus as having swallowed Semele and her offspring, while the other (Gruppe) understood Hesiod, Theog. 886, ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν (i. e. Metis) Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἐὼν ἐσκάτθετο νηδύν, as 'Zeus received her into his thigh.'

11. Pp. 95-102. Adolph Philippi of Giessen remarks on Thuc. VI and VII. The Olympic festival at which Alcibiades appeared with seven chariots must have been Ol. XC, 420 B. C., and not four years later. In VI 46, of the votive offerings on the Eryx, for ἀργυρὰ πολλῶ κτλ. we should read, not ἐπάρ-γυρα, 'plated,' with Meineke, but ἐπάργυρα or ἀργυρὰ τὰ πολλὰ. In view of the sums needed (60 talents monthly, or at least yearly), silver-plated vessels would be of no account at all. In VI 64, καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἐμπρήσειν should stand after αἰρήσειν. In VI 103, for αὐτὸν ἐκομίσαντο, read αὐτοὶ κτλ. In VI 101, πρὸς must be inserted, to read ἀπὸ τοῦ κύκλου ἐτείχιζον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τὸν κρημνὸν κτλ. Cf. the following: ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρὸς τὸν κρημνὸν αὐτοῖς ἐξείργαστο, and c. 103, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπιπολῶν καὶ τοῦ κρημνώδους ἀρξάμενοι κτλ. A number of annoying words or phrases which are unnecessary or at variance with other statements or known facts, are ejected summarily. *E. g.* VI 46 ἐκ τῶν τριήρων, VII 19 ὅπως μὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κτλ., VII 36 οὐκ οὔσης αὐτοῖς ἐς πάντα κτλ., VII 53 τὴν ὀλκάδα, VII 56 πλὴν γε δὴ τοῦ ξύμπαντος κτλ., VII 60 ἡλικίας μετέχων (which, in truth, hardly seems to be needed to say of any man in the Athenian camp near Syracuse); in VI 68 οὐκ ἐν πατρίδι has usurped the place of ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ.

12. Pp. 102-104. Wichmann of Eberswalde offers a few suggestions of generally unnecessary corrections to the text of Lucian's Dialogues of the gods. I 1, for τί χρὴ λέγειν, he would read τί χρὴ καὶ λέγειν, for XX 11 for πρὸς ὅτι ἀποβλέψω would read πρὸς ὅτι καὶ κτλ. In VIII 1 τί γὰρ χρὴ ποιεῖν he would insert μὴ before χρή. In VI 5 for the vulgate ποιεῖσθαι he would read ἡκειν, and ἐν μέρει for παραμένει in XX 8.

13. Pp. 105-111. Hitzig of Berne reviews W. Roeder's contributions to the explanation and criticism of Isaeus (Jena, 1880). Roeder intends to prepare an exegetical and critical edition of this author. He defends the authority of the MSS against the recent critics who have made unnecessary corrections because they considered inadmissible certain deviations from ordinary prose usage of the uses of the moods. *E. g.* he shows the MS authority for the fut. opt. with ἄν outside of dependent sentences, and makes it probable that Isaeus used even the fut. ind. with ἄν. He claims for Isaeus seven examples of the potential optative without ἄν. He treats also of the omission of ἄν in conditional sentences of the second class (contrary to fact), and the question whether as in Homer so in good Attic prose the subjunctive without ἄν is found in relative sentences relating to the present or future. The answer to this question depends, of course, on each man's view of the value of MS authority.



14. Pp. 111-112. Sitzler of Tauberbischofsheim gives as a supplement to his edition of Theognis the results of the last collation of the best codex, Mutinensis A.

15. Pp. 113-122. Ludwich of Königsberg reviews Abel's edition of Colluthus's Rape of Helen (Berlin, 1880), of which now for the first time we have a revised text with critical apparatus, a firm foundation for our study of the author. Ludwich gives the results of his partial collation of the text of this poem in the just mentioned Mutinensis A. This is the oldest MS of Colluthus, but the editor is thought to have followed it too closely. Thus the rule of Nonnus, to whose school Colluthus belonged, is known to be that a trisyllabic oxytone with short ultima is avoided at the end of a verse. The only exception to this in Colluthus is 177 ἀρωγόν. This the editor gives, following Mut. A, instead of ἀρωγῆν which conforms to the rule and is found in all the other MSS. The rule just stated is further extended in this poem, in which oxytone amphibrachs are avoided not only at the end of the verse but everywhere, even before the feminine caesura. The editor is praised for his caution in admitting conjectures, but is rebuked for allowing changes which break the Nonnian rules that neither a noun nor a pronoun should ever suffer elision, and that proparoxytone amphibrachs are allowed only immediately before the feminine caesura. The reviewer modifies a former statement that Colluthus seems to have avoided entirely the use of the particle τῆ.

16. Pp. 123-128. Hachtmann of Seehausen on Livy XXV. He proposes 16 § 10, *quandoque res quo for quando res quoque*; 34, 13 *alia auxilia via haud difficilis* for *alia auxilia haud*, etc.; 35, 8 *utroque* for *tuto*.

17. P. 128. Prebisch of Tilsit would read *ignis* for *ignes* in Ovid, Met. XV 355.

18. Pp. 129-138. Nissen of Strasburg, in defence of his views against Hankel (see Am. Jour. Phil. II 531), gives an interesting discussion of the Roman camp according to Polybius. He rejects Hankel's reduction of the breadth of the *intervallum* from 200 to 100 feet. He sets the breadth of the trench as in general only 6-10 feet. Taking into account the stakes for the fortification which the Roman soldier had to carry, the weight of his pack is calculated to be about 40 kilos (88 pounds), which makes him on the march little but a beast of burden. The length of the side of the camp is reckoned as 2150 feet, leaving 2100 feet (after subtracting the entrance) for which each legion had to provide a wall. Camp was always pitched before a battle. This was one of the first Roman commandments of war. The *velites* had nothing to do with the entrenchment of the camp.

19. P. 138. Prebisch of Tilsit suggests for Quint. Curtius Rufus VII 4, 4 *expertus es unum quemque* to read *expertus es* (in passive sense, 'it is known of you') *tu quoque*.

20. Pp. 139-140. Sommerbrodt of Breslau considers the entire § 58 of Cicero's Cato Major to be an interpolation which interrupts the connection of thought. § 59 takes up the picture of country life which has extended from § 51 to § 57, and in § 60 the whole passage is closed by the thought that these rural joys are open to old age until its last hour.

21. Pp. 140-142. Emil Wörner of Leipzig suggests *astus* for *arcus* in Hor. Car. III 26, 7.

22. Pp. 143-144. Rossberg of Norden offers half a dozen conjectures to the *Silvae* of Statius.

### III.

23. Pp. 145-160. Christ of Munich on a particular kind of interpolations in Homer. Kirchhoff has well said that it is a wholly unscientific procedure to point out passages in the text as interpolations without explaining the aim or reason of such interpolations. Thus the investigations of the origin of the Homeric poems are made more difficult. It is one of the most dangerous mistakes of criticism ancient and modern to remove difficulties by brackets without showing what could have led a rhapsode or a grammarian to insert those verses. The reason for many interpolations can be given at once. An Athenian did not like to miss Theseus among the heroes of the lower world, and so, according to Plutarch, smuggled into the text of the *Odyssey* λ 631 *Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα*, and very likely in the *Iliad* A 265 and Γ 144, as it seems to be one of Peisistratus's redactors who in the catalogue of the ships B 558 made the Salaminian Ajax draw up his ships next the Athenians. On a lower level is Θ 533 *ὅς κῆρες φορέουσι κτλ.*, inserted by some versifying grammarian as an explanation of the preceding *κηρεσιφορήτους*. Much of the same kind are the enumerations of the loves of Zeus, Ξ 317-327, and of the Nereids in the train of Thetis, Σ 39-49. Somewhat more free are the additions of sententious verses and fuller descriptions. Such interpolations are found in the text of every author. Peculiar to Homer are the additions which were designed to bind the separate lays more closely together; e. g. O 390-405, inserted to connect more closely the Patroclea with Λ, or Π 60-79 which were inserted after the *Πρεσβεία* had been added, to refer to it. But this article refers to a kind of interpolation which has been less noticed. Whether and how the great national epics of the Greeks, Germans, etc., were developed from single lays is still mooted, but it is undisputed that the bards who on festive occasions sang of the glorious deeds of men and gods did not sing long poems like the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but shorter lays. This is indicated by the contents mentioned, e. g. α 326 fg., ϑ 73-82, 266-366, 492 fg. The one which Homer incorporates in the *Odyssey* is only 100 lines. Others may have been a little longer. The rhapsodes often had occasion to sing parts of the Homeric poems as we have them. Od. ε-ϑ form a connected whole, from the mind of one poet, but still on some occasion a bard might sing not these four books but only the episode of Nausicaa, and end with her return to the palace of her father and the prayer of Ulysses to Athene, ζ 316-327. For a fitting close, ζ 328 *ὥς ἔφατ' ἐνχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη* was added by the bard, and when this line was fixed in the text, vs. 329-331 were added to separate ζ 328 from η ι *ὥς ὁ μὲν κτλ.* So the episode of the battle by the river in φ was suited for separate recitation. Sometimes the whole description φ ι 382 was recited, and at other times only vs. ι-227. In the latter case v. 227 was added as a close, and later vs. 228-232 were inserted to separate v. 227 and its equivalent, v. 233. So Z 311 was added by a rhapsode who ended his recitation there. A similar suggestion is made concerning Σ 356-368 and E 418-430. A more com-

plicated kind of interpolations by rhapsodists is where an episode was particularly adapted for recitation on some occasion, but needed slight additions and changes when it was withdrawn from its original connection, as E 507-511, inserted by a rhapsode who began his recitation with v. 471.

24. Pp. 161-176. Wilisch of Zittau, who had treated the fragments of Eumelus in a programme, gives in detail and with remarks the various passages of the Greek authors which refer to Corinthian epic and lyric poets. He also collects the 14 lines remaining of Corinthian poetry, the pseudo-oracles in Herodotus relating to that city and distichs from Diogenes and Photius, with a consideration of the relation of the government of Corinth to poetry.

25. Pp. 177-184. Friedrich of Mühlhausen in Cicero's Brutus § 145 would read *in augendo, in probando* (for *ornando*), *in repellendo*, comparing *de Or.* II 182. In Orator § 9, for *ea quae sub oculos non cadunt, sic*, etc., read *ea quae sub oculis cadunt, ipsa non cadit: sic*, etc.

Pp. 184-185. Harnecker of Friedeberg urges that the *conditi fructus* of Brutus § 16 must be a historical work; not the great history of Rome to which allusion is made Plut. Cic. 41, but a secret history of his times.

26. Pp. 185-188. Dombart of Erlangen, on the Captives of Plautus, defends his previously expressed view that the two prisoners were on the stage not merely during the prologue but during the first act (cf. 105 *istos captivos duos* and 165 *eccum captivum hunc adulescentem*); showing that the examples adduced of *iste* referring to some one not immediately present, as Capt. 986, are not parallel, as in them *iste* is used as a demonstrative of the second person.

27. Pp. 189-192. Plüss of Pforta on the so-called Swan's Song (Car. II 20), of Horace, gives his view of the situation, occasion, design, contents, worth, etc., of the poem. The poet is dead, his friends are sad, his rivals are joyful, the grave is ready, the dirge is sung, the dearest friend speaks the farewell. The soul of the poet answers the last call of his friend with the declaration that he shall live and work in the future as ideal poet in a broader and more appreciative world. The poem may have been occasioned by a sickness or some other experience which made the poet despondent of his power here and made him mindful of approaching death. "Did Horace write all that stuff?" said Lehrs after he had gone through the ode with his criticisms. It is our own fault if we do not appreciate it.

28. P. 192. Teuber of Eberswalde, in Florus II 13, 26, changes *populationibus et pugnae campos aperuit* to *pubulationibus*, etc.

29. Pp. 193-201. Wodrig of Schwedt reviews Luchs's critical edition of Livy XXVI-XXX (Berlin, 1879). The critical apparatus is prepared with great exactness. Here is shown in detail (what had been discovered by Heerwagen and confirmed by Studemund and Mommsen) that besides the Puteanus, another MS of another family, of the third decade of Livy's history, must have been in existence. Of this readings which resemble those of the lost Codex Spirensis are found now in several stragglers. Both families are considered of equal authority. Where they differ, the decision must depend on Livy's usage. In this matter Luchs has exercised good judgment, with critical acumen and proper regard to the views of other scholars. His discussion of

the lacunae in the Cod. Spir. deserves hearty approval. He concludes from the equality of the two missing passages that each occupied one leaf of the original MS. From the false resolution of ligatures it is inferred that H, the most important MS next to S, was copied from a codex of the tenth or eleventh century, and thus may have been copied directly from the archetype of S. A number of critical remarks are made upon the text.

30. P. 201. Oberdick of Westfalen, for *impurissimo* in Cicero *de domo sua* 18, § 48, reads *spurcissimo*, comparing the imitation by Aelidus Lampridius, Alex. Sev. 9, 4.

31. Pp. 202-208. Opitz of Dresden reviews Hildesheimer's *de libro de viris illustribus quaestiones* (Berlin, 1880). He rightly denies Hermann Haupt's claim that the principal part of this book is derived from Cornelius Nepos. The points of agreement are not enough to make him the chief source. The principal authority is wisely assumed to be Hyginus *de viris illustribus*. Livy also was drawn from. Part of the coincidences with Florus are to be attributed to a common use of Livy (perhaps only a full epitome), part to a like use of some unknown author (perhaps the lost books of Livy). But H. believes that this work is not derived immediately from Hyginus's original work, but from a revised and altered copy. An investigation of the sources of Hyginus follows. Opitz shows that he cannot have drawn from Cicero because his report is the fullest. Where the book *de viris* agrees with Cicero it is probable that Varro was the common source of both.

32. P. 208. Bitschowsky of Vienna defends in Lat. Anthol. 21, 255, the reading *pelagus cum litora frangit* by comparing Statius Achill. I 390 and II 104.

33. Pp. 209-224. R. Unger of Halle continues his critical remarks on the text of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.

#### IV.

34. Pp. 225-235. Knapp of Tübingen makes a contribution to the explanation of wall-paintings. Among the most charming landscape pictures with *genre* scenes are the two companion pieces in the *casa dei Dioscuri* in Pompeii: In one of these a female figure before a straw-thatched hut, clothed in a violet chiton and buff mantle, with a yellow hat pointed at the top (the hat of many of the Tanagrine terra-cottas, the *θολία*), is recognized as an *ἀγύρτρια μαντευομένη*, a servant of Cybele. By a comparison of similar scenes a connection between Cybele and Priapus is made probable. The scene seems to be a copy of a Greek original. In opposition to a view recently presented, Knapp argues that the agreement between a Pompeian scene (Helbig 1150) and a fragmentary group of the Museo Chiaromonti is nothing but accidental. Incidentally he enumerates a large number of representations of Heracles with the cornucopia.

35. Pp. 236-238. G. Benseler of Chemnitz defends the reading *θηρενταί πάντες*, Plato Rep. II 373 B, and shows from the Laws 824 B that the *θηρενταί πάντες* include *οἱ αὐτόχειρες θηρεύοντές τε καὶ οἱ ἐνυγοθηρενταί, οἱ ὀρνιθενταί, οἱ νυκτερενταί*.

36. Pp. 230-240. Büttner-Wobst of Dresden gives from pre-Euclidian inscriptions a short list of coins, weights and measures which are not mentioned in the Thesaurus of Stephanus: δεκάπους, ἐκτεὺς, ἡμίδραχμον, ἡμικοτυλ-, ἡμιπόδιον, ἡμιχον-, κρατενταί (as a lead weight), πεντώβολον, τρισχον-.

37. P. 240. H. Röhl of Berlin makes two ingenious and plausible emendations to Athenaeus. In III 126 B, a fragment of Nicander, for ἡ αὐτοῦ ὄρνιθος he would read ἡ ἐκλυτοῦ ὄρνιθος (the cock), comparing the gloss of Hesychius κλυτὸς ὄρνις · ὁ ἀλεκτρών. VII 302 A ἔρπε τὸτ' εἰς ὕδατος στεφάνους = 'go to the market where the finest fish (ὕδατος στέφανοι) are sold.'

38. Pp. 241-267. A. Daub of Freiburg. Contributions to the lives of the poets in Suidas (Hesychius of Miletus). He discusses with especial fullness the articles on Aesop, Ibycus, Nicander, Sophocles, Sosiphanes, Chaeremon, Anaxandrides.

39. Pp. 267-268. Deiter of Emden, on Caesar's Gallic War VII 35, 2. For *misit captis quibusdam cohortibus* he would read *misit ita apertis quibusdam*, etc.; i. e. certain cohorts of the centre marched in *open order* that the absence of the other two legions might not be noticed by the enemy.

40. Pp. 269-280. Schütz of Potsdam makes critical remarks on the Agricola of Tacitus. 24, 1 *nave prima* means 'with the first fleet,' with which Agricola went beyond the Clyde. This fleet was only of transport boats. In c. 25 we learn that in the sixth year of his command Agricola added a fleet of war ships to his forces (*in partem virium*). Schütz defends 30, 3 *eoque in ipsis penetralibus*, etc., and compares the address of the Roman general c. 34 *fugacissimi ideoque* (like *eoque*) *tam diu superstites*.

41. Pp. 280-282. . . . on an ἀπόρητον Horatianum, the "absolutely unintelligible sentence," Hor. Car. III 10, 9 fg. The writer makes some criticisms in detail, and then asks if any one acquainted with poetry and the Latin language can find in this ode a single attractive, poetical thought, or a graceful figure or a well-turned phrase. He believes it high time to throw such stuff overboard and not confuse or demoralize our scholars with it; to clear out our pseudo-Horace, especially as a reaction seems to be setting in in favor of a more conservative treatment of the poems. (The writer might be advised to read the 27th article of the volume.)

42. Pp. 283-288. M. Herz of Breslau continues his miscellaneous notes on Greek and Latin authors. The fact of the Roman embassy in the 300th year of the city is generally admitted now. Perhaps it is to this that Thucydides refers II 37 (speech of Pericles) *χρῶμεθα γὰρ πολιτείᾳ οὐ ζηλοῦσιν τοῖς τῶν πέλας νόμοις, παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ ὄντες τινὶ ἢ μιμούμενοι ἑτέροις*. This certainly does not refer to the Spartans as Classen supposes.

43. P. 288. Thielmann of Speier in the Carmina Priapea (86, 20 Bücheler; 3, 20 Baehrens) would read *neglegens Priapi* for *neglegens Priapus*. The speaker (the statue of the god) warns his boys not to rob his master's garden, but tells them that they may go to the field of the rich man next door who cares little for Priapus.

T. D. SEYMOUR.